

Gene Bartholomew  
Chester, CT

"Not numbered in order of importance"

1 – There has never been a "conveyance" like this that I am aware of, "State Park to a developer". I have searched for one and asked Daily to provide proof, especially since she has been quoted several times stating "The state frequently undertakes such land swaps". This is not true. When the State undertakes such "swaps" they have stipulations such as, "X shall use said parcel of land for open space purposes. If X: (1) Does not use said parcel for said purposes; (2) Does not retain ownership of all of said parcel; or (3) Leases all or any portion of said parcel, the parcel shall revert to the state of Connecticut. This conveyance does not contain this cautionary and protectionist language, leaving the State (taxpayers) subject to fraud and loss. Question: Has the State ever bought land with conservation money and then "conveyed" it to a developer???

2- It will be argued that this is not a State Park. This is another discrepancy in their arguments. It was to be part of Eagle Landing and is now for some reason considered part of Clark Creek Wildlife Management Area by the DEP. The land was purchased with conservation money, and that money has stipulations as to what it is spent on, specifically land that is to be conserved for future generations. The State would be committing an illegal act by "conveying" it to a developer.

3- The developers have stated, "they're considering building a hotel on the site, if the state agrees to the swap". That's pretty vague, I would hope you want something more concrete. The land the developers want to trade they bought for \$428,000.00 (sometimes referred to as \$450,000.00. The State bought this land for \$1.3 million. The land the developers have is probably not very developable, mostly rock and ledge, the State's land has probably gone up in value. Curiously last year in a Middletown Press article dated 4/28/10 entitled "Haddam investors hope to revive planned land swap" they stated: Independent land appraisals were done showing the value of the forest property to be \$1.4 million and the 17 acres in question to be \$1.2 million. How could that be?? When now suddenly they are back to stating it is \$450,000.00. Too many discrepancies for them to be considered "credible" to me.



4- Senator Daily claimed " the 17-acre parcel is contaminated, has no direct water access and was forced on the state when it purchased another parcel of riverfront land nearby. That latter property, she said, was developed into an attractive marina, with docks, parking and a gazebo, right on the river bank". Well I see no evidence of contamination in the deed, and the State did not make any improvements other than mowing the lawn, the docks were there, formerly the Camelot Cruises, they did however clean up the area. I see no evidence of it being forced on the State either. This is evidence of her "discrepancies".

5- Mr. Rocco of Riverhouse Properties, purchased an 87 acre property on High St in Haddam for \$428,000 in May, 2009. On May 4, 2009, Mr. Rocco stated to Haddam Planning and Zoning Commission that his plan was to convey 54 of those acres (about 2/3 of the total) as permanent open space to a third party organization (DEP) and the remaining 33 acres would be for residential development - 10 units. Plans change huh?

6- There are many "discrepancies" regarding the taxes on the lands involved, I have seen statements made such as: "critics are questioning why the local assessment for the land dropped by about \$900,000 in the town's latest assessment figures. The property in 2009 was assessed at about \$1 million. In the 2010 assessment, the most recent available, the land was assessed at just \$120,000, and "The town now has the 17.7-acre parcel of State owned land (Map 49- Lot 22-2) appraised at \$171,780. The Assessor's card shows 2-acres at 122,500 and 15.4-acres valued at 49,280. The market value in 2009 Grand list was \$1,555,000. This represents a reduction of \$1,178,220 in market value since the State purchased it in 2003 for \$1,350,000. The Riverhouse land (all four lots) totaling 87.7-acres are appraised at a market value of \$324,143. The market value in the 2009 Grand list was \$501,280. This may warrant an investigation, at least a hearing to get the facts straight.

7- With all due respect to the people of Haddam, this is a State Park and owned by the people of the State of Connecticut, whether it is regarded as being attached to Eagle Landing or Clark Creek Wildlife Management Area or neither, it was purchased with conservation money, key word: conservation. All people in the State should be allowed to know about this and weigh in, not just the residents and developers of Haddam.

8- I feel this would set a very dangerous legal precedent because this has not been done before and I challenge Senator Daily and the developers to prove otherwise. Once done no other corporation or developer who wanted to develop on a State Park could be denied his request or he would sue. Therefore I have to, regrettably, consider organizing a class action lawsuit against the State should you allow this "conveyance" to occur.



This is all unnecessary. Let's sit back, take a breath, and move forward in a logical manner, if the developers want the land then let the land be appraised by three independent appraisers, let the developers pay the difference in value, let the developers sign agreements that they will do what they say or the land reverts back to the people.

Yes it would a great business coupe' to get the land and then do what you want, but what about us? What do we get?, Where's my State land? Convey some to me, I'll make money off it too. See, it's not fair. This is America where we should all stand up on our two feet without the help of a Senator, without getting free land. Get a loan, it's what I and everyone I know has to do and we contribute to the economy and it shouldn't matter by how much.

This is just wrong, for all the right reasons.

Sincerely,

*Gene Bartholomew*

Chester, CT

